REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 2-4, which have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schultz, U.S. Patent No. 2,734,024,* in view of *Bank et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,312,579.* Essentially the Examiner's position was that *Schultz* discloses the method recited in the claims, except for the proportion of the softer alloy component and the deposited alloy being increased with increasing coating thickness, which were said to be known as attested by *Bank et al.*

This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is expressly requested.

As set forth in claim 4, Applicants' invention provides a method of producing a workpiece with final dimensions having at least one bearing eye with a bearing eye surface coated with an anti-friction coating made of an alloy of a harder alloy component and a proportion of a softer alloy component. Following processing of the bearing eye surface to a precise fit to a circular cylinder, the anti-friction coating is applied to the bearing eye surface in a thickness corresponding to the final

dimensions without reprocessing of the anti-friction coating, the proportion of the softer alloy component in the alloy deposited being increased with increasing coating thickness.

With the process set forth in Applicant's claim 4, a precisely fit, circular cylindrical bearing eye surface may be assumed. As a result, the final dimension of the running surface formed by the anti-friction coating may be ensured using a thin-layer application of the anti-friction coating without reprocessing the anti-friction coating.

The advantage results that the anti-friction coating has a constructively predetemined thickness gradient which represents an essential requirement for a high service life of friction bearings subjected to high dynamic loads, particularly because comparatively thin anti-friction coatings having a thickness of, for example, 20 to 40 μm are possible within narrow tolerance ranges, if no compensation for imprecisions via the anti-friction coating thickness is required. The requirements for high service life for friction bearings subjected to high dynamic loads is met together with the further requirement that the load capacity of the anti-friction coating itself taking into consideration the

running in conditions requires a comparatively soft running coating by depositing the anti-friction coating made of an alloy of harder and softer alloy components on the bearing eye surface in such a way that with increasing coating thickness, the proportion of the softer alloy component in the deposited alloy is increased. As a result, despite good running in conditions, a sufficient support effort to meet high dynamic loads of the friction bearing may also be applied via the anti-friction coating.

Both the primary reference to *Schultz* and the secondary reference to *Bank et al.*, concern a friction bearing constructed of two half shells. (See, e.g., col. 1, lines 39 and 40 of *Schultz*) Each of these half shells has a supporting shell with a bearing metal based on aluminum and a moving layer made of lead-tin alloy. A work piece having a bearing eye which is directly coated with a gliding layer as recited in Applicants' claim 4 is nowhere disclosed or suggested.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art as represented by *Schultz* or *Bank et al.* cannot be compared with directly coated bearing eyes as recited in Applicants' claim 4.

The bearing half shells according to the prior art are being inserted into the bearing eye of a work piece which has to be parted (separated) for this purpose. The steely supporting shells according to *Schultz* are in no way form-stable (inherently stable) so that it would be senseless to work these supporting shells into the circle-cylindrical form after they have been bent. It is customary to bend these bearing half shells from an even (plane) steel plate (sheet steel) having a constant thickness. A cutting (machining) for producing an exact circle-cylinder form, as is done in Applicants' method as recited in claim 4 is neither purposeful for the methods taught by *Schultz and Bank et al.* nor provided in these references.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither *Schultz* by itself nor in combination with *Bank et al.* can render obvious Applicants' method as recited in claim 4, in that neither of these prior art even concern themselves with the problem to which Applicants' invention as recited in claim 4 is directed. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither *Schultz nor Bank et al.* provide any hint to solve the problems which Applicants' method as recited in claim 4 has solved. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is

patentable over the cited references together with claims 2 and 3, which depend directly or indirectly thereon.

Claims 2-4 were also rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of *U.S. Patent No. 7,178,238*. In response, Applicants are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, thereby overcoming the double-patenting rejection.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the final action and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas RUMPF ET AL.

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802
FJD:djp

Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No.29,298
Attorneys for Applicants

Enclosures: Terminal Disclaimer
Check in the amount of $130.00

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 13, 2007.

Amy Klein

R:\Patents\R\RUMPF ET AL-4\AMENDMENT - 11-13-07.wpd